

Remarks

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halle et al., “Fast Computer Graphics Rendering for Full Parallax Spatial Displays” (Halle) in view of Priem, U.S. Patent No. 5,003,497. The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Halle and Priem taken alone or in combination neither teach nor suggest a computer-implemented method of rendering data for producing a full parallax autostereoscopic display of a digital scene including:

. . . for each image element, determining a distance between said eyepoint and said near clipping plane that would avoid near clipping of said scene, thereby determining a set of near clipping plane distances;

positioning said camera frustra along a z axis in accordance with one or more of said near clipping plane distances;

as required by independent claim 1 and generally required by independent claims 10 and 11. Regarding the “determining a distance . . .” the Examiner refers to the Abstract, Figures 1-10, column 8, lines 28-67, and column 10, lines 1-42 of Priem. Office Action of March 16, 2004, p. 3, ¶1. The applicants respectfully disagree. While Priem does teach a method for determining values of clipping bits, Priem neither teaches nor suggests determining a distance between said eyepoint (as described by the applicants claim) and said near clipping plane (as described by applicants claim) that would avoid near clipping of said scene, thereby determining a set of near clipping plane distances. Moreover, the Examiner points to nothing in either Halle or Priem teaching or suggesting the claimed “positioning said camera frustra along a z axis in accordance with one or more of said near clipping plane distances.”

The Examiner goes on to state that “[i]t would have been obvious . . . to have modified the teachings of Halle et al. such that the clip checking method explicitly disclosed by Priem be implemented, including positioning said camera . . . for at least the

purpose of achieving a desired autostereoscopic display or print of a digital scene.”

Office Action of March 16, 2004, p. 3, ¶1.


The applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In addition to the claim elements not taught or suggested by the cited references as described above, the Examiner has not shown that there is some suggestion or motivation to combine Halle and Priem, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Neither reference suggests such a combination, and the Examiner merely makes reference to “achieving a desired autostereoscopic display or print of a digital scene.” The applicants respectfully submit that “a desired autostereoscopic display or print of a digital scene” can be achieved without the combination, and the Examiner has provided no indication about the source of the “desire” that would motivate or suggest such a combination. Moreover, the applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to explain what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination, as required by, for example, *In re Rouffet*, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Additionally, the applicants note that similar arguments were presented by the applicants in their Response of December 6, 2003. However, the Examiner presented no response to these arguments in his Office Action of March 16, 2004.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 10, and 11 are allowable over Halle and Priem taken alone or in combination. Claims 2-9 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited.

Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on <u>July 16</u> , 2004.	
 Attorney for Applicant(s)	<u>7/16/04</u> Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Marc R. Ascolese
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,268
512-439-5085
512-439-5099 (fax)